



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES

In the thirty-sixth volume of Hoop's *Anglistische Forschungen* Professor John Koch has published a detailed comparison of the eight manuscripts of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* which have been completely printed by the Chaucer Society. The expense attending the publication of Professor Koch's work has necessitated the omission from it of "all details of minor importance," the introduction of "a number of abbreviations," and the substitution of "frequent references instead of giving in full the passage in question." In spite of these abridgments the book contains 422 pages, only nine of which are used by the Introduction.

The manuscripts, in accordance with Koch's previous researches fall, into two groups, designated the A-Type and the B-Type. In the former are notably the Ellesmere, Hengwit, Cambridge Gg. and Cambridge Dd.; in the second, apart from the codices from which only extracts have been printed, the Corpus Christi, the Petworth, the Lansdowne, and Harleian 7334. In his classification Koch has disregarded "the subdivisions into which the MSS. of each of the two Types, according to the 'Specimens, etc.,' ought to be classed, because only part of the codices come here into consideration." For instance, he includes Petworth with Corpus and Lansdowne in his *Cogr* group. That work of the kind undertaken by Koch requires something more than accuracy in tabulation will appear in his declaration of principles. He reminds us that if all sorts of variants in the manuscripts under consideration had been noted his book would have swelled "into enormous dimensions." Accordingly he has as a rule "neglected mere differences in spelling or dialect," carefully registering, however, all cases which he believed to be "relevant for the decision whether there exists a closer or remoter connection of certain MSS. with each other." He has registered also minor details, orthographic peculiarities, which seemed to be characteristic of some of them"; and "side-notes, glosses, headings, and colophons have occasionally been mentioned."

Of the two types distinguished by Koch, A is characterized as being by far the better. "To explain the many deviations of the B-Type from the other, we must assume that its common original was a badly and carelessly written MS., and that its later copyists, not understanding or misreading certain passages, thought themselves obliged to alter them, so that they might give at least some sense, or to fill up gaps by lines of their own—often poor enough—invention." Among other conclusions to which Professor Koch's study of the MSS. has led, we may note the following:- 1. Not one of the eight leading MSS. can be the direct source of the other. 2. Ellesmere, though not faultless, contains the best text of all, being the most complete, and representing very nearly the poet's language. 3. Not one scribe understands exactly the poet's metrical rules, though some of them may now and then have tried to restore defective verses. 4. Not one of the MSS. treated here is the poet's original or directly connected with it, as there are some passages in which all known texts are evidently wrong. 5. The supposition of some scholars that the single Fragments may have circulated before the (relative) completion of the whole poem is not borne out by the appearance of the MSS.

* * * * *

Students of ballad poetry are under great obligation to the late Professor Jewett for her admirable *Folk-Ballads of Southern Europe, Translated into English Verse* (Putnam, 1913). We have here represented many dialects: Roumanian, Gascon, Piedmontese, Catalan, etc., and the editor has in each case printed—what the title of her book does not clearly indicate—the text of the originals. The translations are, of course, not mere rule of thumb renderings. That for Miss Jewett was happily impossible. Her Introduction and her Notes, though in each case brief, will be of special service to those who wish to compare the English and Scottish ballads with those of Southern origin.

Volume I, Part II, Number 2 of the *Washington University Studies* contains nine articles, five of which may be specifically denominated literary. These are George Reeves Throop's *The Lives and Verse of Roman Erotic Writers*, Max Diez's *Über die Naturschilderung in dem Romanen Sealsfields*, Garnett Gladwin Sedgewick's *A Note on Some Critics of Wordsworth, 1798-1820*, Clinton Joseph Masseck's *Richard Jefferies: An Attempt at an Estimate*, and Rudolf Rieder's *Stilistische Untersuchungen zur Kapuzinerpredigt in Schiller's Wallensteins Lager*. Only the last of these is at all technical, the others being thoroughly readable essays. To the list might be added Winthrop Holt Chevery's *The Ecclesiastical Element in the Romanic Language: A Study in Semantic*.

* * * * *

For the Pitt Press Series, Miss Lilian Winstanley has edited the second book of the *Faerie Queene* (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1914). The editor in her more than sixty pages of introduction sets forth in considerable detail general and special influences. In what she has to say of Spenser's *Puritanism* we find no mention of the work of Professor Padelford, who has dealt with this subject in several important articles. Under the heading *Literary Sources of Book II* she distinguishes Mediaeval, Classical, and Italian influences, and furnishes many parallel passages. The editor lays special claim to originality in the essay on Spenser and Aristotle, which constitutes section four of her Introduction. Here she takes issue with Mr. Jusserand (*Modern Philology* 1906) in evaluating the direct Aristotelian influences upon Spenser's twelve moral virtues. For instance, "Spenser's Holiness really does correspond to *ἀνδρεία*, though in the Platonic rather than the Aristotelian sense of the term." Besides its Introduction, the volume is provided with a considerable body of notes. In her preface the editor expresses her indebtedness to the Modern Language Association of America and especially to the essays of Professor Dodge and Professor Buck that have been published by the Association. She has also "freely employed" Miss C. A. Harper's *The Sources of the British Chronicle History in Spenser's Faerie Queene*.